

Plans" presents management's reasons and those of labor. Reasons for discontinuance include high costs, union opposition, legal restrictions, and abnormal conditions arising out of the depression of the thirties and the war which followed. The author contends that none of the reasons found for abandoning guaranteed wage plans condemns the theory or the practice.

Part II contains a brief record of the approach to the problem made by both management and labor. The author summarizes this section by observing that "businessmen generally need to make a mental readjustment, involving a willingness to study the issue, and also to develop a conviction that they must do everything possible to increase the regularity of wages" (p. 169).

Part III deals with long-range objectives and long-range measures for employment security. The author's social philosophy in this connection is reflected in his statement that "employment security which ultimately should be achieved is that wage earners should have at least as much security as those who supply capital to industry" (p. 131).

In Part IV, Summary, the points are made that no one guarantee plan can be applied to all American industry, and no plan should guarantee more than the guarantor can finance or less than the recipients will consider worth while. All guarantee plans should include escape clauses, and plans must prove beneficial to, and receive the hearty support of, both management and labor.

This study should be read widely by those officials in management who are seeking ways and means for the improvement of labor relations and increased production through new incentives. Labor leaders should become familiar with the contents of this volume, and it may well be assigned as collateral reading in university courses on personnel management.

ALBION G. TAYLOR

College of William and Mary

COMMITTEE ON LABOR MARKET RESEARCH
(Louis J. Ducoff and Margaret Jarman Hagood). *Labor Force Definition and Measurement: Recent Experience in the*

United States. Pp. x, 134. New York: Social Science Research Council (Bulletin 56), 1947. \$1.00.

This collaboration does not attempt to tell us how to achieve full employment, but it tells much which is relevant to realistic definition of full employment and to interpretation of current information on the labor force and the degree to which it is being utilized. Though this report is mainly concerned with Census Bureau activities, publications, and problems, it also contains much useful background for personnel people concerned with trends and locations of labor supplies.

The two collaborators named above drafted the main report for the subcommittee whose chairman is Gladys L. Palmer. After four chapters of text in which "the discussion is limited almost wholly to labor force data derived from population surveys," there follow five appendices. Three of these are notes by John D. Durand, Loring Wood, Gladys Palmer, and Ann Ratner, which contribute significantly toward orientation of the Monthly Report on the Labor Force (MRLF) series, which is keyed to the labor force and unemployment sections of the decennial population census of 1940. Appendix E is an annotated bibliography, while Appendix D contains schedules used in census surveys, 1940-45, as well as modifications due to be made in the spring of 1947. This bulletin was evidently prepared in the latter half of 1946, since which time the Bureau of the Census has issued a mass of labor force reports in several series. After even a cursory study of the report here reviewed, one can read these "Current Population Reports—Labor Force" with new interest and can make sounder interpretations.

A few further hints are offered below as to contents and comments. The major factor distinguishing this report and its sources from the rest of the ocean of literature on employment and unemployment is the recent development of sampling survey theory and techniques. The report might well have gone further into the significance, the problems, and the possibilities of the "25,000 households throughout the country selected by scientific sampling methods."

A number of revealing glimpses, however, are given, sounding this note of caution (among others): "The increase of 2.7 million in the employed brought about by a change in schedule used by the *same* enumerators, on the *same* households, for the *same* reporting week, in an attempt to measure the *same* concept of employment, should emphasize the need for re-examination of some of the conclusions based on analyses which have assumed comparability" (p. 68).

There are bound to be twilight zones in any statistical delineation of unemployment, e.g., as to definition of types of members of the labor force, and when a person is underemployed, perhaps by reason of substandard earning rate or opportunity. Our bulletin grapples with many such matters and helps us to find and use available information. The appendices by Mr. Wood and Miss Palmer, for instance, indicate how data from current population surveys may be correlated with other measurements of and in the labor force, such as the Bureau of Labor Statistics employment samples; also how current surveys may yet be modified to give further breakdowns within the labor force data. Already the Census is publishing recent surveys for numerous metropolitan communities; and current labor force samples are being classified into census occupational categories.

It seems a bit odd that the bulletin does not deal with the extension of census labor force classification by industries. Apparently the authors do not share my curiosity as to how the major industrial components of national income estimates may be matched up with corresponding segments of the labor force. The Old-Age and Survivors Insurance records, of course, already present a wealth of individual work histories, showing, e.g., shifts into, out of, and among covered industries, as well as earnings while covered. Surely MLRF data on numerous individuals could also be accumulated over many months, revealing noncovered employment as well as unemployment and underemployment. Checks of these household reports against OASI records on identical individuals, moreover, would be one of the needed

means of assessing household reports for some types of possible systematic bias.

Z. C. DICKINSON

University of Michigan

ARCHIBALD, KATHERINE. *Wartime Shipyard: A Study in Social Disunity*. Pp. vi, 237. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1947. \$3.75.

If the prospective reader of *Wartime Shipyard* first took a rubber stamp and stamped on every page the book's subtitle, "A Study of Social Disunity," underlining *disunity*, he might come out of the experience with a more balanced perspective. If, as he read, he kept reminding himself that these craftsmen who resent the women workers, these workers who make the Okies the butt of ridicule, these Okies (and others) who build their own sense of self-importance on the foundation of prejudice against the Negro—if the reader kept reminding himself that these same people are the plumber who comes to fix the pipes, the Okie who comes to mow the grass, and the pretty girl who slides out the hamburgers at the nearest favorite joint, he would remember that underneath all the verbalization of hatred and scorn there runs a mighty current of warmth and decency.

Wartime Shipyard is a disturbing book, a fearsome book. It lays bare with harrowing accuracy, in individual detail, the crude cargo of contempt and scorn, arrogance and inertia and fear, which our culture and economic organization impose on the individual and which our schools and churches hardly touch.

Every horrible and frightening quotation which Miss Archibald reports has an undeniably authentic ring. A worker said it, exactly as recorded. And what is even more blood-chilling is the thought that if Miss Archibald had spent the same two years which she spent in the shipyard among the shipyard owners and their wives, or attending sessions of the women's clubs of the country, or (who knows?) among the school teachers or even the college professors of the country, she would undoubtedly have been compelled to record exactly the same quotations. The language